



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

# HARVARD THEOLOGICAL REVIEW

VOLUME X

OCTOBER, 1917

NUMBER 4

---

## ZIONISM

KEMPER FULLERTON

BERLIN, OHIO

About six o'clock on the morning of Oct. 12th, 1914, the Porto di Rodi dropped anchor off Jaffa. No one with a particle of historical imagination can look for the first time without a thrill on the scene that spread itself out before us in the long luxurious roll of the Mediterranean and the easy flowing lines of the distant hills. The little city stood opposite us black against the morning sunshine, which came pouring over the mountains and into the Philistine plain. On such a day some two thousand years ago a man had gone up to a house-top in that city. It was also at the sixth hour, though, being Jewish reckoning, this meant the dazzle of the noon. The man did not notice the sky effects. His attention was concentrated upon a curious phenomenon. An object like a great sheet seemed to be descending out of the sky. As it reached the level of the house-top and he was enabled to look into it, he found it full of all sorts of squirming things, every one of them unclean and very offensive. Disgusted at the sight, he was about to turn away when a command came from somewhere: "Rise, Peter, kill and eat." "But I cannot," the man said. "I have never eaten anything common or unclean." "What God hath cleansed make not thou common," replied the voice.

While the man stood wondering at the strange experience, there was a loud knocking at the door, and he was informed that a certain Cornelius, centurion of the Italian cohort, wished to speak to him about a matter touching the welfare of his soul!

Jerusalem, the capital of Judaea, looks eastward and backward; Jaffa, the port of Jerusalem, looks westward and forward. At Jaffa the truth was revealed that religion was to be no longer national but cosmopolitan, that from this port there was to radiate across the freedom of the seas in waves of light as rich and full and vivifying as the eastern sunshine the idea of a religion adapted to the needs of all mankind. *Ex Oriente Lux!*

But is a universal religion capable of keeping itself from secularization? Can a religion flexible enough to adapt itself to the needs of a Hottentot or a New York stock-broker have sufficient inner integrity and resisting power to withstand the tremendous pressures from without? Can religion survive without the unyielding bony structure of dogma and tradition? On the other hand, can it accomplish its world mission if its intended universal adaptability is to be checked and impeded by an anatomic structure incapable of the sinuousness of the serpent? This is the problem which is being worked out before our eyes in Judaism today. It is a problem which, equally, though somewhat less obviously, concerns Christianity also. Zionism is one attempt to solve this problem. For this reason we did not spend the few hours at our disposal before the train left for Jerusalem in a visit to the house of Simon the Tanner where the problem originated, but walked out, instead, to Tell Abib where an attempt is being made at its solution.

Of all the strange sights that greet the Western traveller in the Levant Tell Abib is in some respects the strangest. When we visited this little city it was only some five years old. But it had grown out of the sand

dunes just north of Jaffa with all the rapidity of Jonah's gourd and in 1914 numbered about five thousand inhabitants. In its neatness and concreteness, its uniformity and evident municipal efficiency, it might have been taken for a Gary or a Pullman, bodily transported by the rubbing of an Aladdin's lamp from the flats of Illinois to the flats of Philistia. Here was none of the narrowness or cramp of an old Oriental city, squeezed together by the lateral pressure of its walls of defense. Here were roomy avenues and pretty little public squares, the feeling of space, the suggestion of future expansion. It was of such a city that the prophet dreamed when he promised to the Jew a Jerusalem without walls, where the old men and the old women could sit in the sunshine and the children could play in the streets. One did not have to watch his steps in walking through the streets of Tell Abib, for the "filth of the streets," proverbial in the East, was not to be found here. A perfect sewage system had been installed. Trees had been planted along the sidewalks and in the parks, and were already relieving with their shade the dazzling whiteness of the little concrete houses in the hot October sun. They had been able to attain such wonderful growth in the short space of five years because of the fine municipal water-works, which had tapped the abundant supply of water lying only a few meters below the arid surface of the soil, and enabling irrigation to do its perfect work. Electric lights swung at the street corners. At one point in our walk through the town we passed a municipal theatre; at another a great school building, the largest building in Tell Abib, as finely and solidly built as a modern public-school building in our own country, well lighted, with wide cool halls and many recitation rooms.

There were two synagogues in the town; one, which I took to be the synagogue of the more liberal Jews, significantly located in this school building; the other, the

orthodox, in another quarter of the town. On our walk we had observed that the streets were deserted and we had also noticed the little artificial arbors erected in the courtyards or on the roofs of the houses. In the school building we learned the reason. It was the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles. We entered the liberal synagogue. The apparent lack of decorum in the average synagogue worship is at first the most striking feature to an onlooker, and the more orthodox it is the more tumultuous it becomes. Everybody is constantly moving about and prayer and conversation seem quite compatible in their simultaneousness. A young man whose features were almost feminine in their refinement was chanting what we took to be an ancient Hebrew melody, for it had the same curious and haunting cadences which characterized the Arab music with which we had become familiar, only it was more developed and melodic. The face of this young Levitical singer was tense with emotion. Whether the origin of his feeling was æsthetic and romantic or whether it expressed a genuine thirst for the living God I could not quite decide. There was no question of the genuineness of the emotion at the orthodox synagogue, however. Here men were gathered under their black and white prayer-mantles, whose fringes waved with the restless emotion of the worshippers beneath them. Just outside the door our attention was called to a timid-eyed, stoop-shouldered man. "That is Beiliss," we were told. We were looking at the victim of the latest and in some respects most celebrated of all the ritual-murder trials of modern times. Here he stood, saved in Tell Abib, but with the look of a hunted deer still clinging to him.

But we had come to Tell Abib to meet one of its chief promoters, to whom, through a happy accident of travel, we had secured letters of introduction. He was not at the orthodox synagogue, nor yet at the liberal synagogue.

We were therefore directed to his home, a comfortable modern villa. Dr. Ruppin, to whose energetic work Tell Abib owed so much of its prosperity, was seated at his study table on the last day of the Feast of Tabernacles reading Bergson's *Creative Evolution!* Could anything have been more paradoxical, incongruous! Yet it has always seemed to me that the coincidence had a certain symbolism in it which I have been trying ever since to understand.

What is the relationship of the historical in religion to the essence of religion, of tradition to modernism, of a religion of dogma to religion in an era of science? How is religion to effect the transition from its past historical forms to the new forms or formlessness which scientific and historical inquiry seem to be necessitating, without losing its character as religion and merging itself into mere ethics or philosophical speculation? The man before me, reading *Creative Evolution* in the quiet of his study on the Feast of Tabernacles, while his orthodox fellow-citizens were worshiping under their prayer-mantles in the synagogues of the little city which he had done so much to bring into being, seemed to be the most remarkable embodiment which I had ever seen of these questions so disconcerting to the modern world. In the case of the Jew there is much less chance to dodge these questions than in the case of the Christian. The Christian can gradually abandon the orthodox tradition in which he has been brought up without ever becoming acutely conscious of having done so. In the transition he is not compelled to change from one clearly marked stage of culture to another; he still remains in a Christian civilization, and his associates and associations remain substantially the same. Unless he thinks hard and thinks straight he may never fully realize that he has made a fundamental change in his philosophy of life. But with the Jew it is different. When he abandons orthodoxy he

abandons the ancient Jewish culture and adopts an alien culture. His entire mode of life is revolutionized. For him, indeed, old things have passed away; behold, all things have become new, and *consciously* new. He cannot escape the necessity of looking down into the tremendous chasm which yawns between the Feast of Tabernacles and Creative Evolution. It is this which makes the study of present-day Judaism so instructive to the Christian. The problem of the Christian is in essence the same as the problem of the Jew—the problem, namely, of adjusting himself to an undogmatic form of religion without at the same time ceasing to be religious. But because the problem is more obvious in Judaism, its outlines more clear-cut, a study of it is of the greatest service in awakening Christian thought upon it.

Dr. Ruppin introduced us to his secretary, Miss Cohen, of Cleveland, Ohio, and after going up to his house-top (the only Orientalism connected with our visit) to get a bird's-eye view of Tell Abib, we were accompanied by them on a tour of inspection through the city and had it interpreted to us. Tell Abib is thus far probably the completest expression of Zionism. It is a home in Palestine for the oppressed Jews of all nations, a home in which they can develop unhampered what they believe to be their own peculiar culture and their religion as the most important element in that culture, and where, because of their isolation, they can make the attempt to adjust themselves at the same time to the culture of the modern world without becoming extinguished by it. Tell Abib means practically Springtime, Renaissance. Here, it is hoped, the Jewish people will experience a new birth. The city administration is entirely in the hands of the Jews themselves. In taxation, in the judiciary, in the police administration, Tell Abib is autonomous. What is of at least equal importance, the official language of the municipality is Hebrew, not Yiddish but the classical

Hebrew! It is revised, of course, to suit modern needs, but the attempt is made to develope it organically out of the Old Testament and the Talmud. If the community does not possess a word to meet its needs it sends to a philological committee which sits in Jerusalem and secures one. It is especially through this use of the Hebrew language that the effort is made to preserve the peculiar culture of the Jew. In its isolation from a dominant Western culture, in its use of Hebrew which is favored by this isolation, in its public-school system in which the Jewish child is introduced to modern culture through the medium of his own language, and in its connection with the previously established agricultural colonies of Palestine, Tell Abib is the completest embodiment of Zionism, the attempt of Judaism to preserve itself from disintegration as it emerges into the modern world. Will it succeed? In order to answer this question it is necessary to give a brief review of its origin and development.

In origin Zionism is the immediate outgrowth of anti-Semitism and can only be understood in the light of that movement. Anti-Semitism is not simply a recrudescence of the mediæval religious antipathy to the Jew, though that antipathy is no doubt found in it, especially among the Russian peasantry. It is the result of two great movements in the nineteenth century—the economic transition to the industrial era, and the new emphasis upon nationalism. At the end of the eighteenth century and the first half of the nineteenth century the democratic spirit which produced the American and French revolutions also operated in favor of Jewish emancipation. It was in this period that the Ghetto was practically abolished throughout Europe, though in Russia the establishment of the Pale of Settlement in 1791 became in a way its substitute. In this period the Jews of western Europe as contrasted with the Jews in eastern Europe became practically free, politically. The immediate consequence

of emancipation in western Europe is seen in the new status of the Jew in the industrial world.

The era of emancipation coincided to a very large extent with the development of industrialism in Europe. Now throughout the Middle Ages the Jew had been confined for his livelihood very largely to money-lending, as this occupation was prohibited to the Christian. But the money-lender was at this time the usurer. He loaned money to Christians who were in financial needs. This did not tend to his popularity. Further, because of the fact that his calling was not recognized by the law and was exposed to great risks, the interest charged was proportionately high. This increased the popular ill-will toward him. But with the rise of industrialism money-lending, as Dr. Ruppин points out,<sup>1</sup> took on a new form. It now became banking, and was utilized not to stave off bankruptcy but to initiate business. The Jewish money-lender was no longer a leech, sucking the blood out of the needy Christian; he became the ally of the Christian in his industrial enterprises. Again, because money-lending now became a legalized practice, it was not necessary for the Jew to charge his former extortionate interest rates in order to protect himself against the risks of his business. Thus the odium of money-lending passed away, because, as Dr. Ruppин would have us believe, Christian business now adopted Jewish methods. No more striking instance of the change from the view of the Jew as a usurer to the view of him as a capitalist, is to be found than in the first recognition of the Jews in England. It was the city of London which was the first city in England to look upon them with a friendly eye, and as early as 1668 Sir Joseph Child, governor of the East India Company, "pleaded for their naturalization on the score of their commercial ability."<sup>2</sup> As a capitalist

<sup>1</sup> *The Jews of Today.* Henry Holt & Co.

<sup>2</sup> *Encyclopædia Britannica*, XV, p. 406.

the Jew began to take his place in European civilization among the bourgeoisie, the great industrial middle class, and because his instinct for trade had been sharpened by the bitter experiences of the Middle Ages, he soon began to exercise an influence in this class out of all proportion to his numbers. But the industrial class had become the most powerful class in Europe. The Jew, therefore, as one of the most influential members of this class, at once attained a commanding position. The consequence was that the very movement which had resulted in his emancipation almost automatically forced him into a situation which was calculated to rouse new jealousies and oppositions.

These were still further aggravated by another development in European thought. The great tidal wave of democracy, which originated in the French political earthquake at the fall of Louis Philippe and the establishment of the Second Republic (Feb., 1848) and rapidly swept over Germany and Austria, was followed by a heavy ground-swell of nationalism. This is most clearly seen in the movement for the unification of Germany. Hegel also, who wrote in the first half of the century, had developed a system of ethics in which the theory was advanced that the life of the State is the culmination of ethical development. But the State must be a unit like the individual; ideally it must contain no heterogeneous element within it. At once the question arises, What is the relationship of the Jew to the State? Is Judaism a religious or a racial phenomenon? In the former case the Jew might reasonably be expected to coalesce with the State in which he was born; in the latter case he would be regarded as an alien and therefore a dangerous element in the State by those who accepted Hegel's theories of nationality and ethics. Thus with the emergence of the Jew out of his Ghetto as a leading factor in the new industrial era on an equality with the Christian before

the law and a successful competitor, and with the insistence in Europe upon the principle of nationality, which was favored by the most important democratic movements of the time<sup>1</sup> and encouraged by one of its most influential philosophers, a new and very serious crisis was prepared for the Jews.

It was precipitated in Germany in 1873 in the movement known as anti-Semitism and spread like wildfire throughout Europe. In 1873 the wild speculations due to the unexpectedly speedy payment of the French indemnity, had run their usual course and a great crash came. Many Jews were involved in the financial scandals. In the same year a pamphlet was published by a certain Wilhelm Marr on *The Victory of Judaism over Germanism*, in which Hegel's doctrine of the State was made the basis of an attack upon the Jews as an alien element. By 1879 anti-Semitism had become a burning political question. The brilliant writer of the article on anti-Semitism in the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, from which this brief sketch of it is mainly drawn, lays the responsibility for this upon Bismarck. The Jews had been very prominent in the National Liberal Party, which had been the chief support of Bismarck in his unification of the Empire. But conditions had changed, and this party had now become distasteful to him. It is suggested that Bismarck utilized the anti-Semitic sentiment in order to bring the party into discredit. The Conservatives and the Catholic Centre could be relied upon in the contest; the first because they represented agrarian capitalists who were naturally suspicious of the industrial capitalists, the second because they had old scores to pay off for the activity of the Jews in the Kulturkampf. An anti-Semitic League was formed in Berlin and Dresden, and the movement was launched. The two most conspicuous anti-Semitic leaders were Pastor Stöcker, who, as head of the so-called Christian Socialists, formulated more particularly the

economic indictment against the Jews, and Hermann Ahlwardt, who urged especially the racial indictment (Marr's book went through nine editions in 1879). The latter attack was by far the more bitter and unscrupulous and calculated to rouse the passions of the ignorant. This led to mob demonstrations and in 1892 to the revival of the ritual-murder charge, while in the literary propaganda some went so far as to reject not only the Old Testament but Christianity itself as expressions of Semitism.

The movement lost ground in Germany in the decade 1892–1903, but acquired new vigor in 1903–07. This is significant, for it is in these years that Jingoism and Anglophobia became rampant in Germany in connection with the great naval programme and the adoption of *Welt Politik*. The movement thus begun in Germany spread into Austro-Hungary, and finally culminated in Russia in the enactment of the infamous May laws of 1882 and the massacres of Kishineff (1903), Odessa and Bielostok (1905), while in France it issued in the unspeakable scandals of the Dreyfus trials (1894–1906). It will be seen that anti-Semitism ran its course in the quarter of a century 1880 to 1906. Wherever the movement is examined it is found sooner or later to become inextricably involved in the struggle between the reactionary and nationalistic ideals in Europe on the one hand and the progressive and cosmopolitan ideals on the other. It is this which makes the study of anti-Semitism so instructive. While it is probably a transient phenomenon, it has left two historical changes behind it of vast significance. The first is the migration of nearly two million east-European Jews into the United States, the direct result of the persecution of the Jews. The consequences of this upon the economic, social, and religious life of this country are simply incalculable. The other change for which anti-Semitism is at least indirectly responsible is the denunciation by the French government of the Concordat and

the disestablishment of the French Church. This momentous event grew, at least in part, out of the anger of the French government at the clericals who had played a very prominent part in the opposition to Dreyfus. But what has all this to do with Zionism?

That the two movements are intimately connected historically is suggested by the date at which the Zionist movement was inaugurated. This was in 1896. We have seen how the anti-Semitic movement began and practically ran its course in the last decades of the nineteenth century. It was therefore just in the midst of this frenzy that the Austrian Jew, Theodor Herzl, published his *Judenstaat* (1896). He proposed in effect that the Jews should accept the premise of their opponents, admit that they were a nation, and hence seek to establish themselves as a nation in some unoccupied part of the world, preferably Palestine. A number of congresses were held, great enthusiasm was aroused, and in 1903 an offer was actually secured from Lord Lansdowne of a large tract of land in East Africa for colonization purposes. But this was bitterly opposed by many of the Zionists themselves, who believed that only in Palestine was there any hope of setting up successfully a Jewish state.

The scheme of Herzl at once created a great division in Judaism. Western Judaism had for the most part followed in the wake of what was known as the Mendelssohnian movement. Moses Mendelssohn, grandfather of the celebrated composer, believed that the hope of Judaism lay in the adoption of Western culture. Judaism according to him was a religion, not a racial or nationalistic phenomenon. The Jew was a cosmopolitan, in England an Englishman, in Germany a German. The true tie was that of religion, rather than of race. This movement was favored by the cosmopolitan tendencies of the French Revolution. Thus, the Jewish Sanhedrin convoked by Napoleon in 1807 asserted the citizenship and

patriotism of the Jew in France, and agreed to adapt the law of the synagogue, particularly the crucial laws of marriage and divorce, to the law of the land.<sup>3</sup> It was largely owing to the assertion of these cosmopolitan principles that the Jews were so successful in gaining emancipation at the end of the eighteenth and beginning of the nineteenth centuries.<sup>4</sup> Hence the theories of Herzl seemed to many to signify the abandonment of those principles by means of which the Jews had been delivered from the Ghetto. To adopt Zionism was to acquiesce in one of the most dangerous premises of their enemies, and admit that they were an alien element in the nations in which they were living. The powerful movement known as Reformed Judaism which had arisen in the nineteenth century as a logical result of the emancipation of the Jews and their adoption of Western culture, has therefore rejected Herzl's ideas and combated them with the greatest vigor.

The principles of this movement are summed up in classic form in the declarations of the Pittsburgh Conference of American Rabbis in 1885. The fifth declaration reads in part: "We consider ourselves no longer a nation but a religious community, and therefore expect neither a return to Palestine nor a sacrificial worship under the sons of Aaron nor the restoration of any of the laws concerning the Jewish State."<sup>5</sup> The thought of this paragraph is reiterated again and again by the leaders of Reformed Judaism. Dr. Kohler, for example, who was president of the Pittsburgh Conference, insisted that Judaism is a religious truth, intrusted to a nation but destined to interlink all nations as a cosmopolitan factor

<sup>3</sup> Philipson, *The Reform Movement in Judaism*, pp. 26 ff. Many of the facts in what follows I owe to this book and to newspaper clippings from the files of Dr. Philipson which he has kindly placed at my disposal.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the anonymous article on Zionism in the *Fortnightly Review*, November, 1916.

<sup>5</sup> Philipson, p. 492.

in humanity. He repudiated the idea that Judaea is to be the home of the Jew; such a principle would "unhome" the Jew the world over. As long ago as 1841 the Jewish congregation of Beth Elohim in Charleston, S.C., declared that "this country is our Palestine, this city our Jerusalem," and along similar lines are the recent utterances of such leaders of Reformed Judaism as Dr. Schulmann, Dr. Rosenau, and Dr. Philipson. Zionism is, according to Dr. Schulmann, the child of the last decades of the nineteenth century, which emphasized racialism and nationalism as against the earlier principles of individualism, democracy, and cosmopolitanism. He adds very significantly that the divisions of Judaism on this point endanger the problem of the Jew in the coming peace conference. "God forbid," exclaims Dr. Rosenau, "that Israel should be given to the emphasis of nationalism, which is responsible for the national hatreds of the present." According to Dr. Philipson the "race-Jew" is the cause of anti-Semitism. "The Reformed Jews are Internationalists. They cherish the idea of universalism, toward which scientific discoveries, remarkable inventions which bring the most distant parts of the earth into close touch with one another, treaties of peace and arbitration among the nations, seem to point," and they take their stand "on the idealistic interpretation of history, whereof we believe that Israel presents the most striking symbol as over against the nationalistic interpretation whereof the present war, the apotheosis of nationalism, is the climax."<sup>6</sup>

<sup>6</sup> The above citations are interesting reflections of the way in which the present war is aggravating the theological differences of Judaism. Already the possible effects of the peace settlement upon the future of Palestine have become an absorbing question for all Jews. It may also be noticed in passing that not a few among the orthodox have also been suspicious of the Zionist propaganda. The reason is partly theological, and is expressed in the following extract from a letter of Mr. Jacob Schiff to the American Hebrew of Sept. 22, 1907: "The political doctrine of Zionism has nothing in common with the Jewish Messianic hope. There is no Scripture warrant for attempting to establish the Jewish nation by human endeavor. To attempt to force the hand of Providence is always unprofitable."

The fundamental principle for which Judaism as a religion stands is, of course, according to all Reformed Jews, its "God-idea," i.e. its monotheism. The rabbinical law, represented especially by the Shulhan Arukh, the codification of Talmudic Law compiled by Joseph Qaro in the sixteenth century in the attempt to check the threatened disintegration of Judaism at the time of the Spanish expulsion, is discarded by Reformed Judaism. Judaism is a religion of development, and the ceremonialism of the law is only one historical phase. It is not of the essence of Judaism. Its essence is monotheism. The ceremonial must be discarded because it is absolutely out of touch with modern life, and if Judaism is chained to it it will inevitably die. Thus Reformed Judaism would save Judaism first by rejecting the idea that the Jews are a nation and by insisting upon the idea that they are a religious community, and secondly by discarding the vast accumulation of ceremonialism which has expressed the beliefs and hopes of past phases of Judaism and by insisting upon the principle of monotheism as its essence.

To all this Zionism retorts seriatim: Without a nucleus of Jews forming a Jewish nation and permitted to develop its own peculiar Jewish culture unhampered by a superior enveloping culture, the Jewish religion will be lost to the world. If the Jew remains in Western civilization, in the end he will be inevitably absorbed by it. The inducements to conform to the dominant Christian civilization will be too powerful to be permanently resisted. Again it is claimed, it is not the principle of monotheism which has preserved the Jew through the centuries of the dispersion. It is the Law, particularly the ritual law, the dietary regulations and Sabbath observance, which has kept the Jew a peculiar people and prevented assimilation. If the ritual law is abandoned, as the Reformed Jews demand, and if the Jews are at the

same time scattered through the Christian nations with no opportunity to develop their own peculiar culture such as they would enjoy if at least a nucleus of them could remain apart by themselves, the future of Judaism is hopeless. These are the theses of Dr. Ruppin's book *The Jews of Today*. Space forbids us to give in what follows more than a brief résumé of Dr. Ruppin's arguments.

We have seen how in the new era of industrialism the economic status of the Jew became suddenly changed. From a usurer he became a capitalist. The economic distinction between Jew and Christian which had endured for so many generations was thus wiped out. This at once paved the way for assimilation, especially in view of the fact that the Jew speedily occupied a very prominent place in industrialism. But where there is economic progress there is always a declining birth-rate. While the east-European Jew had families of six or ten, his west-European coreligionist began to have families of only two or three. The Jews have always been a prolific race, for marriage and the rearing of children have been considered religious duties. What was lost through assimilation in times gone by had thus been usually made good through the fertility of the race. But this offset to assimilation now becomes abolished in the course of economic development.

Another factor connected with the economic progress of the Jews is their congestion in large cities. The ten cities, New York (about 1,000,000), Warsaw, Buda-Pesth, Odessa, London, Vienna, Chicago, Philadelphia, Berlin, and Paris, contain about one-fifth of the total Jewish population of the world (12,000,000). But large cities are notably centers of religious indifference as compared with rural districts. The life of the town is emphatically a secular life. The Jews in large cities are engaged in the same callings as Christians, which naturally leads

them to associate with Christians, and because of the religious indifference of the city apostasy does not make a Jew a marked man as it would in the country. Assimilation therefore becomes especially easy in metropolitan centers.

Another marked development in modern Judaism is the abandonment of Yiddish and Spaniolisch. These are the mother-tongues of a great majority of Jews and are associated with all that they have been accustomed to hold dear in their religious and racial life. The adoption of the language of a country usually means the adoption of its manners and customs, which is a long step toward assimilation. Dr. Ruppин goes so far as to say that the Jewish religion is on firm ground only where Yiddish is spoken. If this is true, one can see how significant is the fact that more than one-third of the Jews no longer speak their mother-tongues.

But the most important step toward assimilation of the Jew, for which his economic development and the abandonment of his native tongue have paved the way, is his adoption of modern, that is Christian, culture. This is seen on the one hand in the decline of the Cheder or the Talmudic schools, in which only religious and distinctively Hebrew subjects are taught, and on the other hand in the crowding of Jewish children and youth into the public schools and institutions of higher learning. To take just one group of instances, there were in proportion to their numbers four times as many Jews as Christians in Austria (statistics of 1903–04), six times as many in Hungary (1907), and seven times as many in Prussia (1886–91). If the Roman Catholic looks upon the public schools and universities as dangerous to his religion, and if even dogmatic Protestantism seeks to protect itself against secular education by the denominational school and college, how much more fatal is secular education in Christian lands to Judaism! “It is as rare,” Dr. Ruppин

asserts, "to find a Cheder pupil who discards the uses of his religion as it is to find a university Jew who holds fast to them" (p. 135 f.).<sup>7</sup>

Modern education is really incompatible with Jewish orthodoxy. A child brought up in its atmosphere becomes estranged from its orthodox parents and the ties which bind it to its past are easily broken. Thus secular education, which the Jews are drinking in with such avidity, is the precursor of what threatens to be a complete break with the past. Reformed Jew and Zionist are both alike aware of this effect of modern education. The Reformed Jew seeks to offset it by reinterpreting his religion, the Zionist by isolating the Jew in Palestine. With the breakdown of the economic and linguistic distinctions between the Jew and the Christian, with the congestion of the Jews in large cities and the abandonment of the Talmudic education in favor of secular education, it is not astonishing to find a painfully increasing indifference to religion. So long as the Jew was confined by the Christian to the Ghetto his religion was his all in all. In it he lived and moved and had his being, and he does so yet where he is not affected by modern culture, as is the case with most east-European Jews. But once let the economic and educational influences of modern civilization begin to play upon his religion, and it would appear to be doomed in its most distinctive elements, as the Zionists express it, or at least in those elements which keep the Jew distinct from his fellow-men, as the Reformed Jews would perhaps prefer to express it.

As we have seen, it is not the monotheistic principle which primarily distinguishes the Jew; it is his ceremonial laws, especially Sabbath observance, dietary laws, and

<sup>7</sup> The history of the Mendelssohn family is the classical illustration of the influence of modern education upon the Jew. Moses Mendelssohn was the champion of modern learning, and his translation of the Old Testament into German did for the Jew what Luther's translation did for the German. But while Mendelssohn himself remained true to the Law his descendants became Christians.

prohibition of mixed marriages. These laws come to the orthodox Jew as immediate commands of God. They are not principles nor even illustrations of principles but statutory law. They are not to be obeyed because of their inherent reasonableness or because they are capable of a spiritual self-authentication, but because they are enacted by divine authority. Now it is impossible to preserve one's faith in the divine and perpetually binding character of these laws in the face of modern knowledge. Economic pressure and historical criticism alike combine to destroy faith in them. And when faith in them as divine statutes is destroyed the next thing is to abandon their observance. When Peter shrank from eating the unclean contents of the heavenly sheet, his scrupulousness was justified if it was his desire to remain a Jew. As surely as he ate those things, just so sure was it that he or his spiritual descendants would cease to be Jews. As a matter of fact this is what happens wherever the Jew listens to the imperious command of economic necessity, as in the case of Sabbath observance, or to the teachings of science and history, as in the case of most of the other customs of his ancestral religion. There remains, therefore, to bind him to his coreligionists only his belief in monotheism. This tie alone in the opinion of Zionists as represented by Dr. Ruppin is altogether insufficient. Even though his racial attachment may keep him from immediate conversion to Christianity, the facts teach us that he is apt to become altogether indifferent to religion, and while he may remain for a time formally within the pale of Judaism the chances are that he will finally succumb and go over to Christianity.

Perhaps the most significant fact of all that testifies to the rapid disintegration of Jewish religious life is the increase of mixed marriages in western Europe. Since the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the law against mixed marriages has been the most effective means of self-pro-

tection which Judaism has possessed. But in the Sanhedrin assembled by Napoleon, in which, as we have seen, the cosmopolitanism of the French Revolution was especially influential, it was decided that the Law expressly forbade only marriage with Canaanites.<sup>8</sup> Since there were no longer any Canaanites, the inapplicability of the law to present conditions was sufficiently obvious. The fact that marriage had also been changed from a purely religious to a civil contract also favored mixed marriages. While there are practically no mixed marriages in eastern Europe, the practice steadily increases as we move westward and find the Jew securing economic independence and modern culture, though of course it has been checked in some measure by anti-Semitism. The effect of mixed marriages upon assimilation is clearly seen in the education of the children; in most cases they are brought up as Christians. The last stage in the assimilative process is conversion to Christianity and baptism. Here too the defection is far greater than is commonly supposed. While conversion in the evangelical sense, that is, conversion through the various missions to the Jews, is practically negligible, conversion due to economic and social reasons is frequent.

Basing himself upon the above arguments which are supported by very carefully worked out statistical tables, Dr. Ruppin concludes that Judaism is doomed unless something very definite can be done to check the assimilative process. It is true the east-European Jew is as yet largely unaffected by the influences to which the west-European Jew has been subjected. But as industrialism makes its way into Roumania, Galicia, Bukowina, and above all Russia, and as the Jews in those countries secure the same political rights and educational opportunities enjoyed by their western coreligionists, there is no reason to hope that they will not follow the same line of development as their western kindred, give up all

<sup>8</sup> Ruppin, p. 159, n. 1.

that is distinctively Jewish and ultimately become merged into the Christian population which surrounds them. Thus the only hope of the Jew, according to Dr. Ruppin, is, first, to be placed in a position where he can return to the soil; this will make him economically independent and secure for him a stability which his commercial instincts do not now permit him to enjoy. In the next place, there must be local segregation, so that he will not be continually tempted to conform to the dominant western, that is, Christian, culture. He must be taught modern science in his own language, so that it will not come to him in an alien form. If modern knowledge is acquired through the medium of Hebrew, he will be enabled, it is hoped, to adjust himself to the new world of thought without breaking too violently with the past. Lastly, he must be taught in his own schools, and the culture of the east-European Jew, which is the only strictly Jewish culture still surviving, must be made the basis of the new educational development. These conditions for the preservation of the Jewish race and Jewish culture can be found, it is claimed, only in Palestine. Hence the proposal of the Zionist to solve the problem of Judaism by the erection of a Jewish state in Palestine.

Zionism appeals strongly to the sentimental and romantic instincts of the Jew and even of the Christian.<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, it is not inconceivable that in the settlement to follow on the present war, especially if the Ottoman Empire is overthrown, Palestine may be formed into a neutral Jewish state, which would give to Zionism a standing in the domain of practical politics which it does not now possess. But looked at from the point of view of theory, it is doubtful whether Zionism can be regarded as a permanently satisfactory solution of the problem before Judaism. It is avowedly based on economic and social considerations. Zionism, at least as represented

<sup>9</sup> Temperamentally it may be compared to the Pusey movement in the Anglican Church.

by its protagonists, also adopts modernism. It is in no sense a return to Jewish orthodoxy. But can its desire to preserve the Jew by isolating him be fulfilled unless it frankly adopts the orthodox standpoint and isolates him spiritually, as it were, as well as locally? The Jewish people after the Exile were reorganized on a distinctively religious basis, and it was that which gave to the new community its stability. Zionism would preserve Jewish culture. But the Jewish culture of which Dr. Ruppin speaks is synonymous with the Jewish religion as that has been developed under the tutelage of orthodoxy. Can the one be preserved without the other? If Dr. Ruppin's arguments that the abandonment of orthodoxy means the doom of Judaism in western Europe are sound, will they not hold good for the fate of Judaism in Palestine as well? Is it to be supposed for a moment that Palestine will remain as secluded from the western world as it is at present? The chances are overwhelmingly against it. The restless West will not leave the brooding East alone, and it is not at all unlikely that we or our children will see the work of Alexander, so far as Hither Asia is concerned, completed. Will a Jewish nucleus in Palestine be able to separate itself from the irresistible march of events? After all, are those spiritual goods for which the Feast of Tabernacles and Creative Evolution respectively stand, really compatible? Is not Zionism, attractive as it is, really an anachronism, as the Reformed Jews assert? Reformed Judaism would seem to be on a far sounder basis when it seeks to solve the problem of Judaism by reinterpreting it in terms of modern life.

On the other hand, what answer can be made to the overwhelming array of arguments produced by Dr. Ruppin, that the principle of monotheism alone is insufficient to prevent Judaism from completely evaporating in time in a Christian atmosphere? The problem of the Jew is indeed a painful one and should be studied by the

Christian student with sympathy, for in it as in a magnifying-glass he may perceive the problem which is pressing ever more closely upon himself, the problem, namely, of the reconciliation of a dogmatic religion with modern culture. Catholicism, Greek and Roman, corresponds in Christianity to the orthodoxy of the east-European Jew. Protestantism, with its ever closer approximation to secular culture, corresponds to the Judaism of western Europe. As cosmopolitan culture advances, what effect will it have on Protestantism? Will it have the same effect as it has on the Jew? Will Peter's obedience to the command that came to him on the house-top of Simon the Tanner at Jaffa and which broke down nationalism in religion and introduced the era of cosmopolitanism, prove to be the first step in the merging of not only Judaism but Christianity itself into the general movement of civilization, in which dogmatic religion will have no place? These are some of the questions which a study of contemporary Judaism unavoidably raises, but which it is not the purpose of this article to answer.